

REMARKS:

Claims 1-17 are in the case.

The Examiner has required restriction from among three Species. In response, applicants elect the prosecution of claims directed to Species III, illustrated by Figs. 9-16.

This is believed to entitle applicants to examination of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 12*, 13, 14*, 15*, 16*, and 17.

The claims identified with asterisks [*] above have not been identified as being included in the elected Species III by the Examiner but are believed to be consistent with the examination of claims directed to the Species of Figs. 9-16. Accordingly, examination of these claims is also respectfully requested.

Although an effort has been made to correct the specification, the correction to the drawings are respectfully held in abeyance pending the indication of allowable subject matter in this application for two reasons. Firstly, it is not believed an absolute requirement that the cross-hatching of materials be utilized in all cases. Secondly, as required by MPEP 810, a one month shortened statutory period is set for reply when a written restriction requirement is made without an action on the merits. The Examiner has required a review of the specification, drawings and claims which would be considered an action on the merits, at least with respect to form and, the one month return period provides insufficient time especially since the applicants are Japanese and translations are required for all correspondence. Accordingly, acceptance of this Election without further corrections to the specification, drawings or claims is respectfully requested.

Turning to the specification, the published version of the application at US2008/0231003 has been utilized to make the corrections to the specification. It is also

noted that the Preliminary Amendment for the specification filed on July 13, 2006 does not appear to have been entered, so that these corrections have also been made.

In paragraph 10 of the office action, the Examiner has also required the various elements of the claims to be separated by line indentations. This is not an absolute requirement but during the prosecution of the application on the merits, reformatting of the claims will be considered.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, to advance the application to allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/PETER C MICHALOS/
Peter C. Michalos
Reg. No. 28,643
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: November 6, 2008

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706